

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 remain pending in this application, with claims 1 and 7 being amended. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended for purposes of clarity. Therefore, no new matter is being submitted by these claim amendments.

Rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Alexander (International Patent Publication No. WO 99/04561).

The present claimed arrangement provides a method of processing a program guide. A determination is made as to whether a cell in a channel grid of the program guide has been highlighted. A determination is made as to whether a cell in a program grid of the program guide has been highlighted. In response to the previous determining steps, a program content of a program currently being received by a channel indicated by the highlighted cell in the channel grid is displayed if the cell in the channel grid of the program guide has been highlighted. In response to the previous determining steps, the same program content is continually displayed if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted. The same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in the channel grid is highlighted. If the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, the same program content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in the channel grid is highlighted. Upon highlighting the different cell in the channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by the different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed. Alexander does not disclose or suggest these features.

Alexander describes a system and method for displaying and recording control interfaces that improve upon previous electronic programming guides. Improvements over previous electronic programming guides include: improved viewer interaction capabilities; improved viewer control of video recording; parental controls; improved

television access by the viewer; improved product opportunities for commercial advertisers; improved product information access; creation of user profiles; and utilization of profiles for customization and advertisements (*see* Abstract).

Alexander neither discloses nor suggests that “the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” and “**upon highlighting the different cell** in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said **different channel** corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted **is displayed**” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. Alexander merely describes selecting a “lock/unlock” function to control how a Picture in Picture (PIP) screen displays programs. In Alexander, when the status is set to “unlock,” the PIP displays the program associated with the highlighted channel/program in the Grid Guide. As long as a channel in the channel grid and/or a current program in the program grid is selected, an associated program will be displayed. When the status is set to “lock,” the PIP display continues to display the same program content, regardless of what is highlighted/selected on the Grid Guide. Thus, in Alexander, the program content displayed is based on the setting of the lock/unlock function. In the locked mode, regardless of what is highlighted in the grid, the same programming content will be displayed. This is unlike the present claimed arrangement in which the displayed program content is dependent on whether a cell in the program grid or a cell in the channel grid is highlighted. Program content of a highlighted channel is displayed when **a cell in the channel grid of the program guide** has been highlighted. The program content of the last tuned program is displayed when **a cell in the program grid of the program guide** is highlighted. The present claimed arrangement can scan channels while moving through the **channel grid**. While navigating through the **program grid**, a lock is placed so that “the same program content” can be displayed. Alexander does not disclose or suggest channel and program grids that perform the features recited in the present claimed arrangement. In Alexander, the channel and program grid operate in the same manner based on the setting of the lock/unlocked status. Therefore, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests “continuing to display the same program content, in response to the previous determining steps, if the

cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, wherein the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” and “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement.

Moreover, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests “determining whether a cell in a channel grid of the program guide has been highlighted” or “determining whether a cell in a program grid of the program guide has been highlighted” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. In Alexander, the channel grid and program grid operate in the same manner and are part of a “Grid Guide.” A user may select a certain channel or program on the Grid Guide in Alexander. However, Alexander does not disclose or suggest “determining whether a cell in a channel grid of the program guide has been highlighted” or “determining whether a cell in a program grid of the program guide has been highlighted” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. In fact, there is no reason or motivation for Alexander to determine “whether a cell in a channel grid of the program guide has been highlighted” or “whether a cell in a program grid of the program guide has been highlighted” because Alexander does not differentiate between a channel grid and a program grid of the program guide, as in the present claimed arrangement. Therefore, as there is no reason for Alexander determine “whether a cell in a channel grid of the program guide has been highlighted” and determine “whether a cell in a program grid of the program guide has been highlighted,” Alexander does not disclose or suggest “continuing to display the same program content, in response to the previous determining steps, if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, wherein the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted, upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement.

The Office Action on page 4 and in the “Response to Arguments” section on page 2 argues that the system of Alexander anticipates the present claimed arrangement. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Office Action argues that in Alexander, a “user initially selects a channel from the channel grid of the EPG which causes the PIP window to display the corresponding program. The user then selects the lock function which locks the POP window from displaying any other content which the user selects in the EPG. Thereafter, the user clicks on programs which have no effect on the video displayed in the PIP video. Afterwards, the user selects the unlock function and then selects a different channel in the channel grid which causes the video in the PIP window to change to the video currently being transmitted on the selected channel.” Although Alexander may “lock” onto a program/channel in the PIP window so that no other channel can be selected to be displayed until the lock is removed, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests “continuing to display the same program content, in response to the previous determining steps, if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, wherein the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is **highlighted**” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. The locking and unlocking in Alexander is based on a user selecting either the lock or unlock feature. This is wholly unlike the claimed arrangement which continues “to display the same program content, in response to the previous determining steps, if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, wherein the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” and “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed.” Alexander is completely unrelated to and does not disclose or suggest the features of the claimed arrangement.

Moreover, Alexander does not disclose or suggest “upon **highlighting the different cell** in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell

that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. As argued in the Office Action, once a lock is made to a certain channel for a PIP display in Alexander, the PIP channel being displayed does not change. If the lock is removed, the PIP will display the selected channel as a user scrolls through an EPG. However, locking onto a channel and then unlocking it is not the same as “continuing to display the same program content, in response to the previous determining steps, if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, wherein the same programming content will continue to be displayed **until a different cell** corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is **highlighted**” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. Additionally, in Alexander, a user merely scrolls through channels and displays programs in the PIP display as he/she selects a particular channel/program in an unlocked mode. Therefore, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests “upon highlighting the different cell in said **channel grid**, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. As the channel grid and program grid in Alexander are not distinct and operate in the same manner, Alexander does not disclose or suggest the features of the claimed arrangement.

The present claimed arrangement provides for display of program content based on a highlighted cell in either a program or channel grid and not based on the status of a locked and unlocked function mode. Alexander clearly does not make this distinction. In the present claimed arrangement, a user may tune to “‘Terminator 2’ on HBO, channel 105 ... when a user first entered the surf guide mode. Subsequently ... if a user moves the highlight or focus of the cursor up or down ... to another channel number/name of the program guide, the ARM microprocessor ... will cause tuner 301 to tune to the highlighted channel and display the received video image on window 230. This is also illustrated in Fig. 5B, which shows that the user has caused the highlight to move the channel 104/Headline News, and therefore, the currently received video content 210, corresponding to the show ‘Washington Weekly’ of channel 104 is now being shown on window 230 ... On the other hand, if a user moves the highlight or cursor from a grid in the channel axis 213 to one of the grids indicating a program (e.g., 250, 260 or 270), or

moves the highlight or cursor within the grids indicating programs, the video content of window 230 stays locked to the last program being displayed ” (Specification, page 17, lines 2-19). In this way, there are “two modes of operation for a program guide and a video window depending on the position of a highlight or cursor. When the cursor or highlight is moved to a **channel name/number grid**, the video window will display program content of the program currently being received by the highlighted channel. On the other hand, when the cursor or highlight is moved to a **program grid**, the content of the video window does not change” (page 17, lines 26-32). This is evident in claim 1 which recites “continuing to display the same program content, in response to the previous determining steps, if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, wherein the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” and “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed.” Alexander does not continue to display the same program content “if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, wherein the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” or display “the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted” when a different cell is highlighted.

In Alexander, both the channel grid and the program grid operate in the same manner in locked and unlocked states. The operation of the invention of Alexander does not distinguish between whether a cell is highlighted in the channel grid or whether a cell is highlighted in the program grid (as claimed in Claim 1). That is, that Alexander considers only the case of whether a user has manually locked or unlocked a view for the PIP (as acknowledged in the Examiner’s comments in the Office Action, page 2, point 2, from March 24, 2008). The operation of Alexander will therefore operate the same way whether a cell in the channel grid is highlighted or whether a cell in the program grid is highlighted, where the condition which determines whether the channel contents in the

PIP will change will be depend on whether the apparatus is in a locked or unlocked mode, versus having “the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said *channel grid* is highlighted” as in claim 1.

. This is wholly unlike the present claimed arrangement which continues “to display the same program content, in response to the previous determining steps, if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, wherein the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” and “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement.

Therefore, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests “displaying, in response to the previous determining steps, program content of a program currently being received by a channel indicated by the highlighted cell in the channel grid, if the cell in the channel grid of the program guide has been highlighted; and continuing to display the same program content, in response to the previous determining steps, if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, wherein the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. Additionally, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests that “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in amended claim 1 of the present arrangement.

Additionally, the present claimed arrangement “provides two modes of operation for a program guide and a video display depending on the position of a highlight, cursor or focus. When the cursor, highlight or focus is moved to a channel name/number grid, the video display will display program content of the program currently being received

by the highlighted channel. On the other hand, when the cursor, highlight or focus is moved to a program grid, the content of the video window dose not change” (Specification, page 3, lines 7-13). In this manner, the present claimed arrangement “recognize[s] that it may be desirable to have both the locked and locked display modes when a user is using a program guide to channel surf, especially without the need for additional user set up or any extra key presses” (page 3, lines 1-4). Therefore, the present claimed arrangement continues “to display the same program content, in response to the previous determining steps, if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted” and continues to display the programming content “until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted.” When the “the different cell in said channel grid” is highlighted, “the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in claim 1 of the present arrangement. In this manner, the present claimed arrangement recognizes the need for a simpler program and channel grid that can recognize when a user wishes to change or tune a channel and when a user wishes to scroll through the program guide without changing the currently watched program. The system of Alexander is unable to perform these features as the system of Alexander merely allows a user to place a lock or unlock onto channels. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Alexander does not anticipate or make unpatentable the features of the present claimed arrangement, as claimed in claim 1. As claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 12 are dependent on independent claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2, 3, 5, 6 and 12 are not anticipated or made unpatentable by Alexander. Therefore, applicants further respectfully submit that this rejection with respect to claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 12 has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Claim 4 is dependent on independent claim 1 and is patentable for the same reasons stated above. Claim 4 is further considered patentable because Alexander neither

discloses nor suggests “wherein the determining steps are entered into in response to a user selecting a user selectable option” as recited in claim 4 of the present arrangement. Alexander merely describes a user controlled “lock/unlock” function for determining the status of the PIP display. Alexander does not utilize the “lock/unlock” user selectable function to determine if a program or a channel grid is highlighted. Instead, the “lock/unlock” function is used to determine the program content displayed in the PIP. In contrast, the present claimed arrangement allows the user an option to select a cell in either the channel grid or program grid. This selection triggers a response of determining whether or not a channel grid or program grid has been highlighted. Therefore, Alexander neither discloses nor describes “wherein the determining steps are entered into in response to a user selecting a user selectable option” as recited in claim 4 of the present arrangement. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.

Independent claim 7 provides an apparatus including a user control device, a display window for displaying a video program and a control means for displaying a program guide. The program guide includes a channel grid and a program grid. The control means provides a first mode of operation in which when a cell in the channel grid is highlighted by the user control device, the display window will display program content of a program currently being received by a channel indicated by the highlighted cell in the channel grid. A second mode of operation is provided in which when a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device, the program content of the display window does not change. The programming content continues to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in the channel grid is highlighted. Upon highlighting the different cell in the channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by the different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed. Alexander does not disclose or suggest these features.

Alexander describes a system and method for displaying and recording control interfaces that improve upon previous electronic programming guides. Alexander neither

discloses nor suggests that “a second mode of operation in which when a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device, the program content of the display window does not change, wherein the programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” and **“upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed”** as recited in claim 7 of the present arrangement. Alexander merely describes selecting a “lock/unlock” function to control how a Picture in Picture (PIP) screen displays programs. In Alexander, when the status is set to “unlock,” the PIP displays the program associated with the highlighted channel/program in the Grid Guide. As long as a channel in the channel grid and/or a current program in the program grid is selected, an associated program will be displayed. When the status is set to “lock,” the PIP display continues to display the same program content, regardless of what is highlighted/selected on the Grid Guide. Thus, in Alexander, the program content displayed is based on the setting of the lock/unlock function. In the locked mode, regardless of what is highlighted in the grid, the same programming content will be displayed. This is unlike the present claimed arrangement in which the displayed program content is dependent on whether a cell in the program grid or a cell in the channel grid is highlighted. Program content of a highlighted channel is displayed when **a cell in the channel grid of the program guide** has been highlighted. The program content of the last tuned program is displayed when **a cell in the program grid of the program guide** is highlighted. The present claimed arrangement can scan channels while moving through the **channel grid**. While navigating through the **program grid**, a lock is placed so that “the program content of the display window does not change.” Alexander does not disclose or suggest channel and program grids that perform the features recited in the present claimed arrangement. In Alexander, the channel and program grid operate in the same manner based on the setting of the lock/unlocked status. Therefore, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests “a second mode of operation in which when a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device, the program content of the display window does not change, wherein the programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell

corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” and “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in claim 7 of the present arrangement.

The Office Action on page 5 and in the “Response to Arguments” section on page 2 argues that the system of Alexander anticipates the present claimed arrangement. Applicants respectfully disagree. The Office Action argues that in Alexander, a “user initially selects a channel from the channel grid of the EPG which causes the PIP window to display the corresponding program. The user then selects the lock function which locks the POP window from displaying any other content which the user selects in the EPG. Thereafter, the user clicks on programs which have no effect on the video displayed in the PIP video. Afterwards, the user selects the unlock function and then selects a different channel in the channel grid which causes the video in the PIP window to change to the video currently being transmitted on the selected channel.” Although Alexander may “lock” onto a program/channel in the PIP window so that no other channel can be selected to be displayed until the lock is removed, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests “a second mode of operation in which when a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device, the program content of the display window does not change, wherein the programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is **highlighted**” as recited in claim 7 of the present arrangement. The locking and unlocking in Alexander is based on a user selecting either the lock or unlock feature. This is wholly unlike the claimed arrangement which does not change “the program content of the display window” when “a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device” and displays, “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted.” Alexander is completely unrelated to and does not disclose or suggest the features of the claimed arrangement. Moreover, Alexander does not disclose or suggest “upon **highlighting the different cell**

in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in claim 7 of the present arrangement. As argued in the Office Action, once a lock is made to a certain channel for a PIP display in Alexander, the PIP channel being displayed does not change. If the lock is removed, the PIP will display the selected channel as a user scrolls through an EPG. However, locking onto a channel and then unlocking it is not the same as “a second mode of operation in which when a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device, the program content of the display window does not change, wherein the programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a **different channel in said channel grid is highlighted**” as recited in claim 7 of the present arrangement. Additionally, in Alexander, a user merely scrolls through channels and displays programs in the PIP display as he/she selects a particular channel/program. Therefore, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in claim 7 of the present arrangement.

The present claimed arrangement provides for display of program content based on a highlighted cell in either a program or channel grid and not based on the status of a locked and unlocked function mode. In the present claimed arrangement, a user may tune to “‘Terminator 2’ on HBO, channel 105 ... when a user first entered the surf guide mode. Subsequently ... if a user moves the highlight or focus of the cursor up or down ... to another channel number/name of the program guide, the ARM microprocessor ... will cause tuner 301 to tune to the highlighted channel and display the received video image on window 230. This is also illustrated in Fig. 5B, which shows that the user has caused the highlight to move the channel 104/Headline News, and therefore, the currently received video content 210, corresponding to the show ‘Washington Weekly’ of channel 104 is now being shown on window 230 ... On the other hand, if a user moves the highlight or cursor from a grid in the channel axis 213 to one of the grids indicating a program (e.g., 250, 260 or 270), or moves the highlight or cursor within the grids

indicating programs, the video content of window 230 stays locked to the last program being displayed” (Specification, page 17, lines 2-19). In this way, there are “two modes of operation for a program guide and a video window depending on the position of a highlight or cursor. When the cursor or highlight is moved to a **channel name/number grid**, the video window will display program content of the program currently being received by the highlighted channel. On the other hand, when the cursor or highlight is moved to a **program grid**, the content of the video window does not change” (page 17, lines 26-32). This is evident in claim 7 which recites that “when a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device, the program content of the display window does not change, wherein the programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted, upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed.” Alexander does not continue to display the same program content “if the cell in the program grid of the program guide has been highlighted, wherein the same programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” or display “the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted” when a different cell is highlighted in the channel grid. Rather, in Alexander, both the channel grid and the program grid operate in the same manner in locked and unlocked states. Both the channel grid and program grid scan through channels as different cells are highlighted/selected in the unlocked state or the previously tuned channel is continuously viewed when highlighting/selecting cells in both the channel grid and the program grid in the locked state. This is wholly unlike the present claimed arrangement which recites that “when a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device, the program content of the display window does not change, wherein the programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” and “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the

different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in claim 7 of the present arrangement. Therefore, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests “a second mode of operation in which when a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device, the program content of the display window does not change, wherein the programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” as recited in claim 7 of the present arrangement. Additionally, Alexander neither discloses nor suggests that “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed” as recited in amended claim 7 of the present arrangement.

Additionally, the present claimed arrangement “provides two modes of operation for a program guide and a video display depending on the position of a highlight, cursor or focus. When the cursor, highlight or focus is moved to a channel name/number grid, the video display will display program content of the program currently being received by the highlighted channel. On the other hand, when the cursor, highlight or focus is moved to a program grid, the content of the video window dose not change” (Specification, page 3, lines 7-13). In this manner, the present claimed arrangement “recognize[s] that it may be desirable to have both the locked and locked display modes when a user is using a program guide to channel surf, especially without the need for additional user set up or any extra key presses” (page 3, lines 1-4). Therefore, the present claimed arrangement recites “a second mode of operation in which when a cell in the program grid is highlighted by the user control device, the program content of the display window does not change, wherein the programming content will continue to be displayed until a different cell corresponding to a different channel in said channel grid is highlighted” and “upon highlighting the different cell in said channel grid, the programming content of a second program which is currently being received by said different channel corresponding to the different cell that is highlighted is displayed.” In this manner, the present claimed arrangement recognizes the need for a simpler program and channel grid that can recognize when a user wishes to change or tune a channel and

when a user wishes to scroll through the program guide without changing the currently watched program. The system of Alexander is unable to perform these features as the system of Alexander merely allows a user to place a lock or unlock onto channels. Consequently, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that Alexander does not anticipate or make unpatentable the features of the present claimed arrangement, as claimed in claim 17. As claims 8-11 and 13 are dependent on independent claim 7, it is respectfully submitted that claims 8-11 and 13 are not anticipated or made unpatentable by Alexander. Therefore, applicants further respectfully submit that this rejection with respect to claims 1, 8-11 and 13 has been satisfied and should be withdrawn.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

No fee is believed due. However, if a fee is due, please charge the additional fee to Deposit Account 07-0832.

Respectfully submitted,
Mao Uong Neil

By: /Joel M. Fogelson/
Joel M. Fogelson
Reg. No. 43,613
Tel. No. (609)-734-6809

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing, LLC

Application No. 10/031,056

Attorney Docket No. RCA89577

P.O. Box 5312,
Princeton, NJ 08543-0028
June 24, 2008